

Appl. No. : 10/795,777
Filed : March 8, 2004

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated July 27, 2006. Applicants have amended the application as set forth above. Specifically, Claims 1, 4-6, and 16 have been amended, and Claims 3, 14-15, and 17 have been canceled without prejudice. Upon the entry of the amendments, Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 16, and 18-28 are pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Sixth Paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph. The Examiner asserted that the term “means for” must be modified by functional language.

Applicants respectfully submit that the terms “control means for” and “processing means for” are followed by functional language that modifies the “means for” terms. On the other hand, Applicants respectfully submit that the term “angle control means” does not invoke 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph as this term is not followed by “for.” Therefore, Claim 14 does not violate the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

Nonetheless, in order to solely expedite the prosecution and facilitate early issuance of a patent, Applicants have canceled Claim 14 as set forth above. Therefore, this rejection is moot.

Discussion of Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that Claims 3-13 and 17-28 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the original base claim and any intervening claims.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Berestov (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,399 B1), and in view of Cox (U.S. Patent No. 5,383,013). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and submit that the rejected claims are patentable over the references. However, in order to solely expedite the prosecution of this application for early issuance of a patent, Applicants have canceled Claim 15 and amended Claims

Appl. No. : 10/795,777
Filed : March 8, 2004

1 and 16.

First of all, in view of the cancellation of Claim 15, the rejection of Claim 15 is moot.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of Claim 3, which the Examiner indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form with the limitations of base and intervening claims. Now, Claim 1 includes all the limitations of Claim 3 with the original limitations of Claim 1. As such, Claim 1 is now allowable.

Claim 16 has been amended to incorporate all the limitations of Claim 17, which the Examiner indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form with the limitations of base and intervening claims. Now, Claim 16 includes all the limitations of Claim 17 with the original limitations of Claim 16. As such, Claim 16 is now allowable.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants have endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns, which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 10/26/06

By:



Mincheol Kim
Registration No. 51,306
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

3053044
102506